

**REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

**I. Status of the Claims**

Claims 1 and 7 have been cancelled.

Claims 2-6, 8, 10-17, 21-26, 29, and 31-42 have been amended and the amendments do not add new matter. Specifically, claims 5 and 13 have been rewritten in independent form. Claims 2-4, 6, 8, 10-12, and 14 have been amended to recite the proper dependency. Claims 15-17, 21-26, 29, 31, 32, 34, 35, 37, 40, and 42 are amended for grammatical reasons and not for reasons of patentability. Claims 33 and 38 have been amended to recite the feature of “filtering errors” and support can be found, e.g., in claim 5 as originally presented. Claims 34, 36, 39, and 41 have been amended to clarify where the error message in these embodiments is received.

Claims 2-6, 8-42 are pending in the application.

Claims 1 and 26 have been objected to for informal matters. Claim 1 has been canceled and claim 26 has been amended pursuant to the Examiner’s suggestion. Applicants request that the objection be withdrawn.

**II. Acknowledgment of Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for allowing claim 32 and for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 25.

**III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 2, 4-8, 12-15, 17, 22, 24, 26, 33, 34, 36, 38, 39, and 41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,000,046 to Passmore. The Examiner states that Passmore discloses all of the elements of the claimed invention, including prioritizing an error relative to other errors not yet resolved, filtering errors that require a different level of response, and providing an assistance option to a system element. Applicants have cancelled claims 1 and 7 and thus have rendered the rejection to these claims moot.

Applicants respectfully traverse the above rejection because Passmore does not teach or disclose every element of the claims. Claims 4, 12, 22, 26, 36, and 41 recite the feature of “prioritizing errors”. Claims 5 and 13 have been amended to be in independent form and along with claims 26, 33, 36, 38, and 41 recite the features of “filtering errors” or “applying an error filter.” These claimed features are not taught or suggested in Passmore

The Specification describes “filtering” as when “the central resource filters errors according to the types of response or remedy required. Such filtering is accomplished by an error filter ... [and] the filter may separate out those errors that cannot be resolved without some physical change or human intervention.” Specification, page 10, lines 18-21. Claims 5, 13, 26, 36, and 41 require the step of filtering the errors to sort which errors require different responses. For example, a number of errors may be received in which the software can correct a majority of the errors. The remaining errors must be handled by a human operator. Additionally, “an error that requires another system element to take action to resolve the issue may be redirected to the other system.” Specification, page 11, lines 2-4.

In contrast, Passmore does not filter errors. Passmore only teaches and suggests presenting the first error first. “[S]ince all error messages are displayed by the error processor, the

first error message received will be displayed first, and this error message is most likely the error message produced by the process that first discovered the error condition.” Passmore, column 5, lines 49-58. A chronological listing does not assist in determining which errors require which responses. The order in which an error is received has no bearing on how the error should be resolved. Applicants submit that listing errors in the order in which they are received is not filtering the errors. Passmore simply puts the errors in chronological order.

Further, the Specification describes “prioritizing” as identifying “errors that present the most significant threat to the continued operation of an underlying system element.” Specification, page 8, lines 18-20. A “significant threat” could be an error that occurs in a critical program or on a crucial terminal and not necessarily the first error that occurs in time. *See*, Specification, page 8, line 20 to page 9, line 9. Claims 4, 12, 22, 26, 36, and 41 recite “prioritizing” elements and Passmore cannot “prioritize” if the first error is always handled first.

As above, Passmore only lists the errors in chronological order. The chronological order of errors is not an indicator of the severity of the errors. “For example, the operating system or some primary program that manages many other programs [usually] are more crucial than their respective application programs or modules.” Specification, page 8, line 20 to page 9, line 1. A later error from a more crucial system may be more important than an earlier error from another system. A chronological ordering does not list errors in the order of importance because, for example, the first error may be an error in an application and the second error may be an error in the operating system running the application. Thus, Passmore does not teach or disclose prioritizing the unresolved error events.

In addition, claims 8, 15, 17, 26, 34, 36, 39, and 41 recite the step of “dispatching assistance to the system element” associated with or originating the error. The Specification defines





problem. Bortcosh is aware that his system can be informed “that there is one or more problems to be diagnosed” but only provides “an overview of the process of diagnosing and correcting a problem, once it has been identified.” Bortcosh, column 3, lines 14-15 and 24-25. Thus, Bortcosh is silent on how he handles multiple problems.

Ito does not teach or suggest the elements lacking from Passmore and present in the independent claims. Ito discloses a “computer-supervising system.” Ito’s system provides a central system to monitor other networked computers. *See*, Ito, column 2, lines 7-45. However, Ito does not prioritize, or transmit assistance to the system element from which the error event originated. Ito just displays an error message on a screen for “an operator attending on the terminal unit 11 ...[can select] a display zone (or row) of an error message on a fault ... [for carrying] out recovery operations.” Ito, column 5, lines 34-36. Thus, Ito’s error messages corresponding to respective faults are displayed together ... and a recovery procedure ... [is] selected by the operator.” Ito, column 8, lines 4-7.

Thus, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the above rejection.

